



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0510MO-1 for Jefferson City Public Schools

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant articulates a clear vision that meets all four core educational assurance areas and speaks directly to Absolute Priority One of the Race to the Top District Program. The vision includes the use of academic academies to promote personalization and multiple specific pathways to college and career readiness.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district has provided sufficient evidence to support meeting this criteria. The application cites leadership team participation in the determination of schools to participate. The district has chosen to include all schools in the district in this proposal. Twelve elementary, two middle and two high schools are named which results in 8,748 students and 570 educators being served.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district provides exhaustive evidence that a high quality plan exists in regards to district wide reform beyond the participating schools. The provision of a logic model includes development of a national model for academies and integrated career centers that can be used by other districts. The plan provided is strengthened through its identification of needs and barriers for students, goals, outcomes and projected impact of the project.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district outlines a vision that will improve learning and performance in all areas. The goals, as outlined, are very ambitious in terms of scope and outcome. The end result as defined by the district includes meeting or exceeding ESEA benchmarks as evidenced by the desired decrease in achievement gaps for low income sub groups by 28 percent and a significant increase in graduation rates, college enrollment and successful completion rates by the final year of the grant. There is ambiguity around the identification of sub-groups as listed in goals (i.e.. Indian and Native American) as well as a lack of evidence that the number of students obtaining post secondary degrees is ambitious given the 100 percent graduation rates within the sub-group or cohort (Native American).</p>		

### B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Comprehensive evidence describing the capacity of the district it advance learning and increase equity is provided via an evaluation of the district by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education that was conducted in 2011 to</p>		

specifically evaluate reading recovery programs. School improvement plans with ambitious goals and significant improvement data were also included.

The district also provided evidence that student performance data is made available to students, parents and educators via online portals and applications for Android and Apple devices. No evidence of data being provided to parents without internet access was stated, and equity of access is a concern given the high incidence of free and reduced lunch qualifications within the district. Data provided is somewhat limited in certain areas such as reading recovery data (2011-2012) with only half of the students successfully exiting the program and special education graduation rates increasing and then decreasing again in 2010.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district provided ample evidence that there is a high level of transparency with regard to financial process and practices. The district cites the publication of such material via district websites, public meetings, and the provision of opportunity for public review. The district also included a plan to establish a web site for the grant to generate public access to the projects.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district has met this criteria through evidence that supports sufficient autonomy under state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to successfully implement the plan. The district cites the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education plan 10 x X 20 plan as being in direct alignment with the projects proposed as well as state statutes that support the autonomy of local districts to implement personalized learning environments. The district also noted that the local school board's commitment to develop and implement policy that directly supports personalized learning within the district.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district provided a comprehensive description of the process used to solicit engagement and feedback for the proposal. This included surveys and meetings with parents, community members and all teachers. Survey responses were included in the application as well as documentation supporting that 78% of all teachers in the district support the initiative. Community support was reported via twenty-eight letters from parents, local businesses, parent teacher organizations, and other organizations.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The district has provided a thorough plan to analyze their current status as well as needs and gaps that the plan will address. This is supported through a detailed action plan that includes activities, timelines and deliverables as well as the party responsible for the task. To support this process the district has identified supports and agencies that will assist in the process and facilitate timely and useful information being gathered.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The district has identified an appropriate plan of action based on the current needs of the students it serves. In addition, existing and needed resources have been identified that can be used to target improved learning objectives. For example,</p>		

existing district guidance counselors will be used to assist in developing personalized plans of study and Project Based Learning will be implemented to facilitate deep learning experiences. A detailed action plan that provides clear explanations and outcomes is also provided but relies heavily on counselors. The counselor to student ratio (289:1) does not support the activities described and does not provide evidence of an achievable outcome in this instance.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
-----------------------------------------	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A comprehensive action plan for teaching and leading is provided by the district. The district has a clear plan for the provision of professional development that supports personalized learning opportunities as well as a clear plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective educators through the implementation of the Focus on Excellence in Education (FOEI) program. The plan is clear in scope but lacks in specificity in terms of activities and deliverables and also does not speak directly to the recruitment of quality teachers. For example, while middle and high school levels are cited specifically, there is limited evidence to support that the activities will increase personalization for elementary school students. The plan also does not provide adequate detail regarding how data will be specifically used to improve instruction and educator practice.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district has demonstrated their capacity to support this project through the restructuring and reorganization of Central Office and Jefferson City High School. This reorganization was specifically undertaken to support student learning personalization and building administration autonomy to support the initiatives described in the logic model. Further evidence of district organization that supports personalization includes the implementation of a competency model at the high school level where students will be able to earn credit based on demonstrating mastery of competencies rather than earning credits via the traditional seat time model.

The district provides limited information regarding accessibility to instructional resources and practices for special education and English language learners (ELL) in the classroom. While they do make a statement that connects personalized learning to increased student outcomes, they do not provide evidence of a plan that would accommodate ELL students specifically beyond the provision of ELL teachers and translators.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
--------------------------------------------------	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district has demonstrated that the existing infrastructure currently supports personalized learning. In addition the district has articulated a plan to enhance the existing infrastructure to capture data regarding post-secondary students and to provide current students access to technology beyond the school day. Stakeholder support will be provided via a technical support program for students by peers and an after-hours help desk to assist parents and educators in accessing online data. The district also provides evidence that current data systems support interoperability and provide evidence of continuing in that direction with the implementation of a single sign on system. This will allow access to longitudinal data from a variety of sources to better inform instruction and decision making. The plan does not provide for equity issues in terms of access to technology and online portals which is of concern for low-income sub-groups.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The evidence provided by the district supports the existence of a high quality plan to continuously monitor, correct, and

improve its plan. This is supported by the district engaging in strategic planning and the use of the Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence Framework.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identifies strong evidence that a high quality plan exists to communicate and engage with internal and external stakeholders through the articulation of a web based project tracking system. This plan is strengthened by support of the team leader and data analyst to share information via the web site with stakeholders on a weekly basis.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district has provided the required performance indicators that are ambitious yet achievable. Goals for achievement scores on MAP tests at the end of the grant period are listed as 800 or higher. While the overall expected growth targets are acceptable, some are lower in terms of gains realized (13% or under) at the end of school year 2016-2017. For example, the percentage students whose teacher of record and principal are effective or highly effective is only 13 % upon grant completion.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district provides a comprehensive plan for the evaluation of the effectiveness of grant funded initiatives. This includes the academy model, use of technology, and professional development. The district will provide evaluations from an independent evaluator to a national evaluator that will include stakeholder perspectives and data to ensure that data collection and the process and outcomes are in line with desired outcomes. The plan is well thought out and includes a meta-evaluation as part of the evaluative process.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant has submitted a budget that will support the project, is reasonable in terms of operational costs and rationale and clearly shows which items are one time investments.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	9
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
The district has a clear plan to continue the initiatives from the project after grant funding is exhausted. This includes partnerships with area universities and the continued use of the Baldrige Criteria in a utility based approach to identify continuing opportunities and mitigate threats to continued improvement.		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant has clearly described a coherent and sustainable partnership with several community agencies. A clear plan for the use of data to target resources, up-scaling the model and how the partnership will improve student results over time is included.		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The district has met Absolute Priority 1 through its clear and comprehensive plan to build on all educational assurance areas. In particular, the vision provided by the applicant is strong in its ability to improve student preparedness for college and careers.

Total	210	196
-------	-----	-----

## Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	14

### Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

A detailed budget pertaining to before and after school programming is provided and is adequate for the projects proposed. Evidence of sound rationale is provided but lacks in terms of specificity regarding innovation. The programming that is detailed is similar to existing before and aftercare programs but does include a health care component that would improve teacher attendance and impact student performance.



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0510MO-3 for Jefferson City Public Schools

## A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10

### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant sets forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision centered around Project PERSON (Personalizing Educational Results Structured on Needs).

Beginning with the learner-centered classroom, the applicant does a thorough job of describing various components of a reform vision that build on the four core educational assurance areas. The applicant's approach to implementation appears credible because of the research base which undergirds the proposal's five projects and their supporting actions.

Through the use of high quality plans, the applicant articulates a reform agenda that is both ambitious and achievable. Sufficient details are provided to evaluate the comprehensive nature of the overarching reform.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
-----------------------------------------------------------	----	----

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's provides a strong explanation for the inclusion of all schools in the district in the reform model. The district's leadership decided all schools in the district collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements. With a total enrollment of 8748 students and with 50.1% of these students coming from low income families, the applicant makes a good case for district wide reform. The most extensive of the reform projects is focused on one of the high schools.

The applicant provides a list of participating schools and teachers, as well as providing information on both the percentage of students from low-income families and number of students described as high-need.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does provide a high quality plan and supporting narrative to describe how PERSON will be scaled up and used to support district-wide change. The selected four goals provided in the plan are central to the successful implementation and sustainability of the proposal. The applicant provides a comprehensive outline of activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. The timeline and deliverables appear reasonable, as well as achievable.

The applicant's logic model included as Attachment C provides a well aligned visual to support the narrative regarding the deployment and management of the proposal's five major projects. Since PERSON is such a multi-faceted project, the incorporation of a continuous improvement system will provide useful data regarding the project's implementation.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

9

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals.

The applicant has identified a varied list of annual goals aligned to the 4 areas highlighted in the application's template. The subgroup goals for each of the 4 highlighted areas appear to be both ambitious and achievable given the baseline data provided and the strategies outlined in the proposal.

For example, increasing the graduation rate for black students from the baseline SY 2011-12 of 69.9% to SY 2015-16's goal of 86.6% appears both reasonable and achievable given PERSON's focus on mentoring and other strategies designed to prepare all students for college and/or careers. The increase in graduate rate for all students is estimated to increase each year of the proposal's four years of implementation. This gradual increase is reasonable and expected to reflect the impact of the proposal's goals and activities. The applicant establishes an ambitious goal of all subgroups having a graduation rate 90% for all subgroups in SY 2016-17 with the exception of LEP and Special education.

The annual goals selected for each subgroup for each of the four areas of focus represent significant gains in the subgroup's performance. These gains are made more believable by the incremental nature of the increases reflected in each of the four projected years of performance. The applicant should provide consistency with the identification of subgroups. At one point in the data chart the applicant notes a subgroup identified as Native American and at another point, the subgroup is identified as Indian. An explanation was not provided to explain the difference in terminology.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence from several previous reform efforts to demonstrate the district's clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement. For example, statistical data taken by external evaluators of the district's The Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) program concluded classroom had become less teacher-directed and more learner-centered. In addition findings also showed that grade level collaboration had increased between 71% and 81% of students had reading improvement. The study was especially information because of the focus on learner-centered classroom in the PERSON reform effort.

The district's 2009 creation of a dropout prevention committee that established accountability measures to track implementation processes for increasing graduation rate and decreasing graduation gap for students with disabilities was especially illustrative. Using data

summarized in a Table, the applicant showed that between 2008 and 2011, the graduation rate for all students in the district has increased by 7.7% to 84.9 in 2011, and the graduation gap for students with disabilities has decreased by nearly two-thirds from 49.2 in 2008 to 74.4 in 2011.

The applicant also provided evidence of achieving ambitious and significant reforms in its low-performing schools by highlighting the 2010 school improvement initiative for South Elementary. The effort targeted efforts to improve literacy and mathematics by providing teachers with focused professional development and intervention strategies. A summary of the communication Arts and math improvements at South showed increased scores at grades 3, 4, and 5. Grade 4 mathematics achievement showed an impressive 28.2 increase and grade 5 showed a 24.6 increase. Both these grades' increases were greater than the increases for the district as a whole. The applicant did not identify the assessment used to provide the data summary; this omission detracted from the clarity of the evidence.

Finally, the applicant describes portal sites for both parents and students. The sites appear to provide access to a variety of performance data such as schedules, grades, report cards, and an unofficial transcript. This information is also available using a mobile application to allow easier access to information via mobile devices. More information should have been provided on how the district will make data available to parents without ready access to computers and mobile devices.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of a high level of transparency in LEA, process, practices and investments. In addition to making data to the public available for the following expenditures: (a) Actual Personnel Salaries at the School Level for all School-level Instructional and Support Staff; (b) Actual Personnel Salaries at the School Level for Instructional Staff Only; (c) Actual Personnel Salaries at the School Level for Teachers Only; and (d) Actual Non-Personnel Expenditures at the School Level, the applicant also describes a methodology for providing transparency to its stakeholders, including community transparency in regards to the district's participation in RTT-D.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does provide evidence that the district has the successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement PERSON. Rules enacted by the State Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education such as Missouri's 10 X 20 Plan appear to give LEAs authority to align policies and support with the demand of college and career, as well as the authority to develop incentives to maintain Personalized Plans of Study for students in grades 7-12.

The applicant also cited a number of additional state laws and regulations that would provide the flexibility needed to institute some of the reform efforts identified in PERSON. For example, beyond minimum requirements, the state's General Assembly enacted a school flex day in 2009. According to the applicant this allows students to follow alternatives to the traditional school day model and allows flexibility to attend class a minimum of 2 hours per school day. According to the applicant this will allow students to pursue timely graduation, provide evidence of college or career education enrollment or provide proof of employment aligned with the student's career academic plan. This type of flexibility does appear to allow for the individualized learning opportunities that are embedded in PERSON.

In addition to establishing virtual public schools in 2006, the applicant also cites Section 161.210, RSMo that gives the SBE the authority to waive or modify any administrative rule it has adopted or policy implemented by the Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes an intricate process developed to get meaningful stakeholder involvement in the development of the proposal. The process included an impressive array of both electronic and traditional person-to-person methods which were designed to solicit input from a broad spectrum of the community. These methods included 2,500 student, family and community online surveys. And 2500 community surveys to parents and community members. Because of the relatively low return rate of these surveys 20% for students and 14% for community leaders, the applicant should have described follow-up methods used to increase feedback from these groups. The applicant does describe a process for gain input from a variety of groups to information the continuous improvement process.

The applicant provided signature pages from 78% of teachers indicating their support for the proposal.

Finally, there was an impressive assortment of 28 letters of support from different segments of the local and state communities. Letters of support included PTO presidents, business leaders, as well as government leaders including the mayor and state representatives.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a high-quality plan and a logic model that outline the analysis of the district's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic beyond PERSON. The plan includes activities, timelines, deliverables and identification of responsible parties that are both reasonable and achievable.

The applicant does a good job of providing the research base for some of the basic assumptions regarding the proposal such as student performance at grade 9 being a strong predictor of future academic success, and the validity of using Project Based Learning to counter students' lost of interest in mathematics and science. The high-quality plan, coupled with a descriptive narrative, helped to explain how the needs and gaps will be identified and how data, analysis information and findings will be continually used to propose changes to PERSON project.

# C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	19
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. The plan describes ambitious, but achievable goals, supported by detailed activities, reasonable timelines and targeted deliverables. The person(s) responsible for coordinating the activities for each goal is clearly specified. In addition to the easy to understand plan, the applicant also provides narrative to explain how parents and educators will support the various components of PERSON. For example, one of the centerpieces of students' understanding what they are learning is the development of a personal plan of study (PPOS) beginning in 7<sup>th</sup> grade. Counselors guide this aspect of the project, but it is only one of several interrelated activities that help to support the overarching goal of creating learner centered schools.</p> <p>The applicant provides a good research base to support the selection of Problem-Based Learning (PBL) as an instructional strategy to help students identify and pursue learning and developmental goals, as well as, promote deep learning experiences.</p> <p>The applicant describes a strong strand of career study and exploration linked to college and career-readiness throughout the elementary, middle and high school continuum. Starting in grade 5 students establish educational and career goals, based on individual student portfolios, interest inventories, and learning styles. The capstone of this strand is the creation of 7 career academies. A solid research base is provided for the academy model, with focus given on the use of academies to expose students to broader and more diverse environments by their interactions with professionals in the community. Students self select the academy of their choice which is an excellent way to personalize education. Embedding the academies in the historical work of SREB's High Schools That Work adds to the validity of the academy model.</p> <p>The applicant's Personalized Learning model draws heavily on effective classroom instruction research with an additional focus on assessment and technology. The applicant describes how each student in grades 6-12 will be provided a one to one technology device to access student e-portfolios and interactive learning activities. The narrative and plan also describe the ongoing training students will receive to ensure they understand how to manage their e-portfolios and personal plans of study (PPOS).</p> <p>The applicant did a good job of describing the variety of options available for students who want to graduate early, such as flexible scheduling of course work, dual credit options, embedded credits, and online course work. Moreover, the applicant also provides details for ongoing and regular feedback being provided such as infinite campus's parent portal, as well as e-mail communication and conferences.</p> <p>The applicant notes that 60% of students in the district are classified as high needs and notes that the district has consequently designed all goals and activities with this high percentage in mind. Although the 289:1 high school counselor to student ratio in the district is lower than the national average of 459:1, the level of responsibilities of the school counselor as described in both the narrative and high-quality plan, make the ratio insufficient. The applicant does not provide sufficient information on how the school counselor will provide these additional level of services.</p>		



(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment by helping educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress. The plan describes ambitious, but achievable goals, supported by detailed activities, reasonable timelines and targeted deliverables. The person(s) responsible for coordinating the activities for each goal is clearly specified. The plan provides for a great deal of professional development for educators. The applicant does a good job of aligning the multi-faceted professional development to the tenets of PERSON. For example, using New Tech Academies as a professional development model is a good way to promote project-based learning, one of the primary vehicles used to personalize learning environments and help students graduate on time and college and career ready.</p> <p>The applicant proposes to expand a 2-year old Assessment for Learning (AFL) project for grades K-12, focusing the current teams into action research tiers focused on quality formative assessment and appropriate grading. Educators will receive professional development on such topics as Student Assessment and Data Analysis. In addition, the applicant notes that a fulltime data analyst will be hired.</p> <p>The applicant's narrative and plan provided an overview on how frequent measurements of student progress, as well as feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems will be used to improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness. The applicant noted the state is currently in the process of designing a new evaluation model for teachers, principals, and superintendents. The overview does not provide sufficient information to determine how data from continuous improvement, formative and summative assessments, as well as feedback from the district's evaluation system will be used collaboratively to improve educator practice. The applicant also does not provide sufficient information on how the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals will be increased.</p>		

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant notes that the district was reorganized in September 2012 to provide support and services to all participating schools and to allow for the implementation of a personalized learning environment. The applicant did not provide sufficient details to support this contention.</p> <p>The applicant indicates that flexible staffing within the Academics will allow teachers to co-teach. Other features described as components of PERSON provide students with the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. The decision to graduate early is described as a student decision with students being provided a wide menu of options including flexible scheduling of course work, dual credit options, embedded credits, work study, and online work. The applicant also indicates the availability of competency tests in selected courses where students may demonstrate mastery.</p> <p>The applicant does a good job of using research such as Brooks &amp; Brooks to validate the benefits of a learner-centered classroom pedagogy as one that makes learning resources and instructional practices adaptable and fully accessible to all learners. Project-based learning, for example, is promoted as providing students with a variety of instructional approaches within a contextual, creative and shared environment.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides convincing evidence using the format of a high-quality plan to showcase evidence that the district and school infrastructure can support personalized learning. The plan describes ambitious, but achievable goals, supported by detailed activities, reasonable timelines and targeted deliverables. The person(s) responsible for coordinating the activities for each goal is clearly specified.</p> <p>The applicant indicates the district currently has the capability of matching student-level data from preschool through grade 13. The enhanced data systems described by the applicant will help to inform the individual teacher working with an individual student by providing real-time data on each student. This type of data output has the additional feature of informing the principal on the teacher performance, etc. The applicant's 1 to 1 initiative for laptops has the ambitious goal of providing each student in grades 6 to 12 with a laptop to access on-line learning content by January 2014.</p>		

The applicant also indicates that students will be provided access to computers and internet after school, in the district's library, as well as in public libraries. Additional access is provided by the applicant having evening library hours and providing a robust virtual library supplied by a vendor.

The upgrades described by the applicant to the existing student information system are ambitious and will complement the personalized learning environment. For example, a Teacher Messenger component will allow teachers to communicate via email or portal inbox with parents and students.

Moreover, the applicant specifies that students, parents, educators and other stakeholders will have appropriate levels of technical support included a help desk and online support for after-hours. The applicant describes an innovative approach with the use of "Technology Cadet" program where student provide technology support at selected times.

The data systems according to the applicant are interoperable and allow student information, learning management, instructional management, and curriculum management systems to interact.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a strategy for implementing a continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on the project's goals and opportunities for corrections. The applicant describes the Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence as the centerpiece of the district's continuous improvement of organizational processes, culture and results for PERSON. The Baldrige Criteria framework has a strong history of success within the educational community and the applicant cites data from several school district to attest to the effectiveness of the framework. The applicant provides both a clear narrative and effective visual to outline the components of the framework and to explain how continuous improvement would be deployed in the district. The applicant describes an intricate process of information gathering from a variety of stakeholders to analyze needs and gaps based on the Baldrige framework. This process includes community surveys, focus groups, public forums, as well as interactions with parent organizations to gather needs information.</p> <p>Moreover, the applicant describes how the Baldrige criteria will be integrated into the existing process improvement model of Plan, Do, Check, Act (PDCA). The applicant notes that the district will establish data and information systems that will provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals. In addition, a web-based project tracking system will be established.</p> <p>The applicant describes a strong process for making information public on the quality of the various investments funded by Race to the Top. According to the applicant, the Baldrige Team Leader and the Data Analyst will work together to provide the Information Technology department with weekly updates for the web-based project tracking system.</p> <p>.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In order to provide ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders, the applicant proposes to establish a web-based project tracking system to provide students, teachers, families and the community ongoing updates about PERSON. A webpage will be established for the grant and each of the 5 projects will have a separate web-page. The content of the web-page appears to give both internal and external stakeholders a concise and up-to-date picture of the status of the project. Most importantly, the applicant indicates that the update will also include the latest measures related to project goals and performance measures. Therefore, stakeholders will be able to follow progress on a weekly basis. The applicant's approach is clearly stated and provides an approach for continuous updating the proposal and communicating with stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes performance measures in each of the grade configurations since the proposal spans K-12. The</p>		

measures selected appear ambitious and achievable. For example, the applicant consistently projects a 10 point increase for each of the years of the grant on the Missouri Assessment Project math and literacy indexes at the targeted grade levels. The 10 point is ambitious, but appears realistic in light of the reform efforts dictated by the proposal. Moreover, the applicant's selection of a measure from the school climate scale from the student Advance Questionnaire was especially revealing. This selection is an indication of applicant's strong belief in the efficacy of the student-centered classroom in enhancing students' feeling of respect and value..

The rationale provided for using performance measures to improve student academic performance based on the Missouri Assessment Project Index score is clear and reasonable. According to the applicant measures were selected to provide information on the success of the program at key times in a student's development—specifically at grades 4 and 8 and summative measures at 9-12. Postsecondary enrollment was also measured.

The applicant does a good job of grounding the process of tracking the quarterly progress on all measures to the logic model. The applicant also provides a good research base for the theoretical foundation for the model. According to the applicant, periodic checks of the logic model will be done with stakeholders on a semi-annual basis to avoid program drift and assess implementation fidelity.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
-----------------------------------------------------------	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a reasonable plan to evaluate the effectiveness of RTT-D's funded activities. According to the applicant, an external evaluator will be hired to evaluate the effectiveness of funded activities including the effectiveness of the Academy model, use of technology, professional development for educators, and other key components from the perspective of a variety of stakeholders. The applicant outlines a process for data to be shared with the local external evaluator and with a national evaluator or another entity designated by the Department of Education to ensure that data collection and program design are consistent with plans to conduct a rigorous national evaluation.

The process appears to be well planned and is described clearly.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's budget, including budget narrative and tables, is clearly presented and provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities. The funding requested appears reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal.

According to the applicant's calculations, the operational costs for the project are less than \$383 per student per year. The applicant notes that all funds to support the proposal will come from RTT-D. The applicant provides a breakout of the \$5,258,064 in one-time investments.

It was especially helpful that the applicant included funding for computer laptops for the 1:1 initiative, and also provided follow-up costs, a cost that is often omitted. The applicant's budget narrative is also proactive by providing elaboration on selected budget items. For example, the high first year budget request is attributed to the roll-out costs associated with an aggressive technology plan. Others budget items such as professional development and personnel also received additional explanation. The additional detail provided by the applicant in the narrative added insight into the necessity for the item and its role in implementation of personalized learning environments.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	9
----------------------------------------------------	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides some important general guidelines for sustaining the proposal after the grant period, but a high-quality plan is not provided. Specific overarching goals, activities, and deliverables for sustaining the proposal after the granting period ends are not included in sufficient detail. The applicant identifies a high ranking administrative officer who will coordinate the sustainability efforts and indicates a sustainability team will be named, but the host of activities described are not brought together in a focused effort for sustaining the grant after the granting period.

Several elements of a sustainability effort are in place. For example, the applicant notes such elements as the many letters of support and strategic partnerships with the University of Missouri as indicators of broad-based community support. The applicant also notes one of the fringe benefits of the professional development offered for such programs as “Learn to Lead” and “Aspiring Administrators” will be having a cadre of committed educators who are vested in sustaining the goals of the program.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:  The applicant provides a strong proposal to partner with the Cole County Health Department, Jefferson City Medical Group, Capital Region Medical Center, and St. Mary's Health Center to explore the financial feasibility of establishing a district health clinic to provide healthcare to under-served children within the district and district employees, as well as continue to support other endeavors for healthy, successful students.  The applicant provides a detailed description of the project's six deliverables for the feasibility study, along with the description of 7 educational and behavioral indicators with desired outcomes. The indicators and desired results appear reasonable and achievable. The applicant also provides a research base for the projected outcomes.  Data will be collected by an external evaluator on a quarterly and annual basis. The applicant indicates that 49.5% of the participants in the initiative are students from low-income; consequently, the resources will focus on low-income students. A clear decision matrix is described that includes getting student, family and public comment, and culminates with the district's leadership team evaluating the findings and recommendations of the feasibility study.  According to the applicant if the feasibility study provides evidence to go forth with the implementation of school-based health clinics, the design of criteria and selection process will be the responsibility of the leadership team. The applicant indicates ambitious and achievable measures for the project and describes the results for students of the proposed partnership.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:  Throughout the grant proposal, the applicant provides coherent and comprehensive information on how the PERSON project will build on the core educational assurance areas. The applicant presents a high quality plan to create 5 overlapping projects that are designed to improve learning and teaching through personalization of learning strategies such as New Tech Academies and a focus on project-based learning. In addition, the applicant presents a solid research-based proposal that allows students to accelerate achievement and deepen student learning by the use of mentorship, flexible scheduling, and online course offerings. Through extensive professional development linked to the core strategies of the proposal, the applicant also presents a convincing case for expanding student access to the most effective educators.		

Total	210	200
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

--	--	--

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	13
<p>Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has submitted an optional budget supplement to partner with Capital City Boys and Girls Club, and Jefferson City Area YMCA to provide enhanced afterschool programs that combine academic enrichment, health and wellness. The proposal indicates the applicant will provide 60 after school tutors to both after school programs. The applicant provides statistical data and other research findings to support partnering with these organizations to provide an enriched after school program. The applicant provides a good rationale regarding the benefit of high-yield, after-school learning activities to strengthen students' academic outcomes.</p> <p>The applicant also provides a detailed description for the external evaluation of the program by the collection of data on a quarterly and annual basis. In addition, the applicant offers a reasonable explanation for the integration of this initiative with other ongoing educational initiatives. Essentially, the applicant's proposed budget appears to support the development and implementation of the activities outlined.</p> <p>However, some specifics regarding how the applicant would carry out activities central to the program are not clearly defined. For example, several budget items are not adequately discussed in the budget narrative. The only information provided is the brief description as a budget line item. For example, Afterschool KidsLit and KidzMath programs need additional clarification.</p>		



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0510MO-4 for Jefferson City Public Schools

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a unique vision for school reform that includes establishing Academies to personalize education for students in preparation of career and college readiness. Strategies include transforming the culture of classrooms and schools to produce self-motivated, engaged citizen: 1) integrated college-and career-ready standards and assessments, 2) personalized learning environments, 3) data systems, 4) professional development, and 5) turning around the lowest performing schools and reducing achievement gaps. The applicant describes five well thought out projects that focus on creating Learner-Center Schools, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools, and Smarter Schools, while promoting educator quality and focusing on excellence in education. The vision also includes implementing seven small learning communities at the high school level that use interdisciplinary course work designed with academic standards and rich projects, tied to students' e-portfolios. However, details are lacking in regard to how the goals and activities of each these projects form a coherent reform vision that is tied to increasing equity through personalized student support in K-4 programs. For example, while the applicant describes the use of e-portfolios that will follow students from grade six through high school, and provides a plan for developing personalized plans of study for students beginning in 7<sup>th</sup> grade, little is stated about how personalized learning environments will support K-4 students, in regard to increasing individualized tasks based on students' interests. Overall, the applicant provides a detailed description of a clear vision for reform that addresses the required criteria for implementing an approach that will accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through personalized student supports.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

(a) The applicant includes a description of the process used to determine that all schools in the district would participate in the project. The applicant states that the decision was made by the district's leadership, based on the scope of work of the project and the eligibility of the schools. The district serves 8,748 students (over 2000), and has a low income student population of 51% (over 40%).

(b) A list of the 12 elementary, 2 middle, and 2 high schools is provided.

(c) The applicant provides details regarding the total number of participating students is 8,748 (100% of the district population), with 51% from low-income families. The number of participating students who are in high need is 5,041. The number of educators participating is 521.

The applicant clearly describes who will participate in the project, including the number and percentages of participating low-income students and schools. As a result, the applicant fully meets the criteria required for high-quality district level and school-level implementation of the project.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

9

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a high-quality plan for reform that includes a logic model describing needs and barriers, inputs and resources, project activities, goals, outcomes and impact. Details that clearly explain how each of the five planned projects will support the attainment of goals are provided, and include a rationale for implementation. For example, the applicant describes the implementation of Academies in one high school, that consist of seven small learning communities focused on deeper and broader curriculum that is geared towards college and career readiness. Students in each of these academies will stay together for two to four years, while experiencing the New Tech model of hands on project based learning that addresses real life problems. However, the applicant does not specify how some students in the lower grades will be impacted by reform efforts in regard to personalized learning. For example it is unclear how the students in grades K-4 will utilize project based learning. In addition, while the implementation of new technologies in elementary schools is mentioned, it is unclear how this will directly impact student learning outcomes in grades K through 4. The applicant provides a timeline for implementing and scaling up project activities, and includes goals, activities, dates, deliverables, and the responsible party for each activity. This timeline and supportive narrative provide strong evidence of a high-quality plan for meaningful reform.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

8

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth).

The applicant describes targets for improved performance on summative assessments and includes a formula for calculating the MAP Index score. These targets include achievement of an overall index score of 800 for all students, including low-income students, by the 2016-17 school year. Baseline data and goals for each year of the project are also included and appear ambitious yet achievable, given the planned activities for the project. For example, the applicant provides a well-designed vision for improving student learning that includes the use of a program called Assessments for Learning. The applicant states that 300 teachers are currently operating on Assessment for Learning teams, with a leader and three to six team members at each school. There is a plan to scale up this initiative to include action research on quality formative assessment through continued work with an Assessment Consortium. These efforts, combined with the purchase of an instructional management system and data warehouse system that will provide assessment tools with the ability to disaggregate data make it highly likely that the applicant will be able to improve student performance on summative assessments, and meet their ambitious but attainable academic goals.

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice).

The applicant provides targets for decreasing specific achievement gaps for low-income students that are ambitious yet attainable (approximately between 26-28%) in most cases, given the plans for the project. One concern is the plan to decrease the gap in 3rd grade literacy by 51.2% on MAP scores. This goal may be too ambitious to be attainable at this grade level, since the applicant's plan to implement a Balanced Literacy program targets middle and high school students, rather than elementary readers. The applicant describes the use of a comprehensive data system that measures growth and provides real-time data to teachers, with information that indicates how instruction can be individualized and improved. Other strategies for decreasing achievement gaps include a plan to adapt content and instruction in response to students academic needs and interests. These efforts make it likely that the applicant will be able achieve most of the described annuals goals in this area.

(c) Graduation rates (as defined in this notice).

The applicant provides a table that describes ambitious yet attainable goals for graduation rates among subgroups, and includes free and reduced lunch, limited English proficiency, and Special Education students. The applicant provides details regarding a number of initiatives that will help achieve these goals, such as enhanced academic counseling, personalized learning environments, small learning communities, career academies, and on-line courses. However, it is unclear if the sub-group for Indians, in the table provided, refers to the same sub-group titled native Americans in the post secondary enrollment table.

(d) College enrollment (as defined in this notice) rates.

The applicant's goals for college enrollment are ambitious yet achievable for all subgroups except Native Americans. It is unclear why the goals for this subgroup decrease or stay the same over time, rather than increase from year to year. For example, the applicant states that college enrollment rates for Native Americans in 2011-12 are 66.7%, and sets a target for increasing this rate to 83.3% in 2012-13, and 86.6% in 2013-14. However, the applicant's goals for 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 are all set at 80%. The goals for these last three years are not ambitious for this subgroup, given the data for prior years and the implementation of several well-designed strategies geared towards college-readiness that are likely to result in an increase college enrollment. Examples of such strategies include Personal Plans of Study beginning in 7th grade, Small Learning Communities, seven career academies, and a strong counseling program at both middle and high schools that is focused on the steps needed to attain college and career readiness.

(e) Postsecondary degree attainment.

The applicant provides baseline data for postsecondary degree attainment, along with ambitious yet attainable goals for each year of the project. While some data has not been finalized, the targets are reasonable, given the strong support for college-readiness provided by project activities. For example, the applicant's goal for degree attainment in 2012-13 is 52.5%, with an increase to 60% by 2016-17. This improvement in college degree attainment rates is not broken out by sub groups, however.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence of a clear vision with supports that are likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity, as demonstrated by goals that are, in most cases, are ambitious yet achievable.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant provides demonstrated evidence of increasing student learning outcomes in regard to reading improvement and includes an evaluation conducted by a local university that indicates between a 71-81% of 307 students participating in an Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) program improved in reading. Details regarding subgroups were not included. The evidence provided represents a small number of students and does not clearly describe success in the past four years in regard to student learning across grades. The applicant provides evidence of decreasing the gap in graduation rates among students with disabilities in a table that includes four years of data. The applicant states that this gap has decreased by nearly two-thirds, while graduation rates for all students have increased by 7.7%. However, the applicant does not address college enrollment rates for the past four years, as stated in the criteria.</p> <p>(b) The applicant describes a school improvement initiative in one low-performing school, and provides data for only two years that indicates improvements in communication arts and mathematics in grades three and five. Improvements in grade four were not achieved in either content area. The applicant does not adequately describe a record of success in advancing student learning in low-performing schools for the past four years, as stated in the criteria.</p> <p>(c) The applicant describes a student information system that provides many different methods for providing student performance information to teachers. The system also provides a portal site students and parents that can be viewed through Mobile devices and includes information on schedules, assignments, grades, report cards, immunizations, attendance and unofficial transcripts. The system allows parents to link each student in their household and view all of their children on one site. The applicant does not describe how long this system has been in place, or how many parents and students access the portals. It is unclear if this system is user friendly or adequately meeting the needs of high needs stakeholders.</p>		

Overall, the applicant provides some convincing evidence of a record of success for the past four years in advancing student learning, as well as a clear description of a versatile student information system that will improve participation, instruction and services. Full points were not awarded due to a lack of evidence of a four year record of success in all required areas of the criteria.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a description of 10 methods that provide for transparency in regard to actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, and includes 2012 OCR financial data based on the U.S. Census Bureau's classification used in the F-33 survey of local government finances for: actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only; actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level. The applicant provides a well designed plan to promote transparency of project activities through a web-site that will make tracking information about project activities available to stakeholders. The applicant goes beyond the minimum by providing strong evidence of transparency that includes actual F-33 survey data, with current personnel salaries at each of the required levels mentioned in the criteria. Full points were awarded for this reason.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides details regarding the State context for implementation of grant activities, and includes a clear description of strategies to align policies and support with the demand for college and careers. The applicant mentions that State law provides districts with the autonomy and flexibility to allow for creativity and innovation in the delivery of educational services. For example, State law allows for virtual and online courses to be taught outside of the regular school day and week, and allows for a school flex program that provides an alternative to the traditional school day model. The applicant notes that the State Board of Education is authorized to waive or modify administrative rules, should there be a need to request this in regard to issues with individualized learning opportunities.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of how students, families, 78% of all teachers and principals participated in the development of the proposal, and provides the results of student, family and community surveys, feedback from stakeholders, and 28 letters of support for the project. These letters include support from business owners, the local school board association, the school district foundation, and other community members. The applicant notes that the Mayor and the State were provided 10 days to review the grant application. A letter of support is included from the Mayor.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a high-quality plan for assessing the status of personalized learning environments that includes hiring a data analyst to train teachers in the use of data. The applicant intends to contract with a local university to conduct an external evaluation, assist with a continuous improvement plan, and conduct a needs assessment and gap analysis on the implementation of personalized learning environments. The external evaluator will utilize the logic model and evidence-based practices to guide these activities.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
(a) The applicant provides compelling evidence for providing a sound personalized learning environment with support from parents and educators that helps students understand what they are learning is key to accomplishing their goals. Strategies		



include the use of student directed learning, and instruction that is tailored to meet the goals outlined in online Personal Plans of Study beginning in seventh grade. Specifics about implementing collaborative learning through schools in the New Tech network are provided, as is a description of how students in the Academies will interact with professionals in the business community, and have the opportunity to earn high school or college credit while working with a mentor in a real-world business. The applicant ties these activities to enhancing goal-setting, teamwork, critical thinking and problem solving, in order to improve academic outcomes.

(b) A description is provided regarding high levels of support for students from a mentorship program is mentioned in regard to assisting student in areas of study that are aligned with seven career academies. The applicant clearly describes a number of high quality instructional approaches, such as Project Based Learning and e2020. However, while the applicant states that these PPOSs will be linked with student e-portfolios that allow students to examine post-high school options, it is unclear if the portfolios include the results of project based learning activities. It is also unclear how or if information on PPOSs will be captured in grades K-5, as the applicant states that these will follow students beginning in grade 6. The applicant mentions a math initiative for K-2 students and students in grade 3-5, but does not describe how reading will be addressed at these grade levels. It is also unclear how some aspects of personalized learning environments and support for college and career goals will be implemented in grades K-4. The applicant states that teachers will incorporate information about fields of study and careers into the elementary curriculum, however it is unclear how this will occur. In addition, the applicant mentions obtaining tablet style technologies, projectors, and AppleTV devices to provide for wireless interactive experiences in grades K-5, but does not articulate what these experiences involve. Details regarding how parents will be able to support students with these technologies are limited. The applicant provides a description of a parent and student portal that provides updates on student performance data. Strategies for regular feedback include parent conference, mid-term reports, three week reports from the high school, home visits, phone contact, and e-mail communication. The applicant describes a method for using project-based learning experience to address complex issues in the community, and provides a method for updating Personalized Plans of Study. The applicant mentions providing a high ratio of school counselors (289:1) in order to assist high-need students with staying on track toward meeting college and career-ready standards.

(c) The applicant states that it will provide mechanisms to ensure that students understand how to use the tools and resources required to manage their learning, but does not clearly describe what these are.

Overall, the applicant provides a clear description of a high-quality plan for implementing personalized learning environments that includes several unique strategies, such as mentors, Personalized Plans of Study and technology support. In addition, a timeline with goals, activities and the person responsible for each activity is outlined in the plan. As a result, the applicant provides solid evidence of meeting most of the requirements of this criteria.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
-----------------------------------------	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a) The applicant provides a diverse professional development plan focused on Teaching with Technology; Project-Based Learning, Student Assessment; Teacher Evaluation; Integrated Course Development; Facilitating a Student-Directed Classroom, Delivering Problem-Based Learning, Data Analysis, Technical Pedagogical and Content Knowledge; and Math Investigations. Strategies include hands-on coaching and counseling training on navigating personalized learning environments and helping students to become college-and career-ready. Content will be adapted through Project-Based Learning, where teachers guide students through the curriculum by providing a meaningful question to explore or a real world problem to solve. The applicant describes sound methods for frequently assessing students' progress toward meeting college and career standards using a system called Compass and a model for training teachers called Assessments for Learning. A plan for using information provided by the district's teacher evaluation system to improve teacher effectiveness is presented, along with a description of a vision for utilizing student achievement data that will be incorporated into this system in the future. This plan includes the use of feedback to provide teachers with recommendations, supports and interventions as needed for improvement.

(b) The applicant describes well-thought out strategies for ensuring that educators have access to and know how to use the new technologies described in this proposal. A timeline is provided that describes a plan for hiring consultants to train teachers on Project-Based Learning and Assessment for Learning, while integrating the Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence. The applicant addresses helping educators identify optimal learning approaches through an instructional management system that will inform instruction and personalized learning. This system will provide digital resources to include in the curriculum and allow teachers to match resources to students' needs. However, training in this system is not specified.

(c) The applicant provides a plan to continuously improve school progress towards goals that includes integrating the Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence, Assessments for Learning, and training in new tools such as teacher messenger, assignment submission and grade book to monitor student information e-portfolios. The applicant describes a plan for improving the current teacher evaluation system; however, specifics about this are limited. For example, it is unclear how the applicant will address teacher evaluation of co-teachers in block schedules or how it will use students' projects and portfolios to evaluate teacher effectiveness. It is also unclear how the applicant will incorporate student achievement data from project based learning into a comprehensive teacher evaluation system that measures teacher effectiveness in regard to personalized learning environments.

(d) The applicant does not articulate how it plans to increase the number of highly effective teachers and principals in the district. For example, the applicant does not specify how it will recruit, retain, or train highly effective teachers in hard to staff areas.

In general, the applicant provides a number of solid strategies for helping educators improve their instruction and continuously improve school progress towards goals. However, some information is lacking in regard to how the applicant plans to leverage these strategies in hard to staff schools, as mentioned in the criteria.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly addresses some components of the criteria in regard to policies and rules, and states that it reorganized the Central Office Organization in September, 2012 in order to provide support to all participating schools in regard to the implementation of personalized learning environments. This included strategic planning to implement project activities, and provided principals with the autonomy and flexibility to implement these activities in their schools. The applicant notes that schools will be allowed to utilize block scheduling, co-teaching, and evening virtual or online courses. In addition, the applicant describes how students will be allowed to choose to accelerate programming and graduate early, as well take competency tests in computer science. The applicant also mentions that students will demonstrate mastery at multiple times and in a variety of ways through project-based learning, while ELL students and students with disabilities will be provided learning

resources and adaptable, fully accessible instructional practices through the personalized learning environment provided by project-based learning. These strategies provide evidence of comprehensive policies that will support the implementation of the project. However, some details regarding how re-organization has impacted the roles and responsibilities of educators and non-educators, school personnel decisions and the development, management and control of school-level budgets are not clearly described. As a result, full points were not awarded for this criteria.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

9

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a detailed description of the school infrastructure to support personalized learning that includes student access to computers for utilizing on-line content, including credit recovery programs and access to the internet after school in the libraries. Teachers will have access to an enhanced student information system that includes a Teacher Messenger component for communicating with parents and students send out notifications about assignments that are missing, and send out reminders about assignments. The applicant describes a plan for technical support that will provide students, parents, teachers and other stakeholders with technology support based on a ticket system. There is also a plan to implement a student-run Technology Cadet program for volunteer students with training in tech support and an interest in technology oriented careers. Parents and students will be able to access e-portfolios through an open data format that allows for exporting this information. The applicant describes an interoperable data system that will be able to pull data from systems that manage information on assessment, curriculum and student management e-portfolios, however, specifics regarding how this process works are limited. A separate system is described for accessing instructional management, human resource, financial management, student information and transportation information. It is unclear how or if the applicant plans link these systems or keep them separate. It is also unclear how decision making will be informed by the use of a more comprehensive data warehouse. Overall, the applicant provides evidence of several unique features of an infrastructure that is conducive to personalized learning.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant describes a high-quality plan to utilize the Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence; Focus on Excellence in Education as a means of implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process. This well-described strategy includes efforts to analyze needs and gaps through community surveys, focus groups, public forums and interactions with parent organizations. The applicant describes the use of an existing student management system, (Infinite Campus), that provides a parent and student portal for access to student achievement information. There is also a plan to use the results of frequent measurement and analysis to provide feedback to student, teachers and families regarding improvements in teaching and learning. An innovative plan to report project activities through a website tracking system is also described, and includes a means for the general public to have an up-to-date picture of the status of the project. Overall, the applicant provides evidence of a rigorous continuous improvement plan that meets the criteria, without weaknesses.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant provides a well-thought out plan to further develop key performance indicators for student learning results, as well as staff and leadership performance results. This plan includes hiring a staff member who will coordinate the Focus on Excellence in Education model of continuous improvement, and train personnel on the criteria. The applicant describes the qualifications of this staff member as having evaluation experience and experience using the Baldrige model. Sound strategies for communicating with stakeholders include a web-based tracking system to provide students, teachers, families and the community with ongoing communication. Finally, the applicant describes a plan to have the Baldrige Team Leader and the Data Analyst work together to provide Information Technology with current content regarding progress on a weekly basis. The applicant provides clear evidence of innovative strategies to support ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. As a result, full points were awarded for this criteria.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:		

The applicant describes a clear description of performance measures and instruments, with ambitious yet achievable targets for each indicator and for each year of the grant. Measures of literacy and math are included, as well as measure of non-cognitive information (school climate), career, and college- and career readiness. A rationale for selecting each measure is provided. For example, student achievement will be measured by the State's MAP Index score, which is a measure of performance across all achievement levels. The applicant provides a description of a total of 16 performance measures. A method for calculating highly effective teachers using this indicator is provided, as well as a detailed plan to have an external reviewer track all measures on a quarterly basis. This high-quality plan includes a timeline, activities, dates, goals, and the person responsible for each activity. For example, there is a plan to hire an Assessment for Learning consultant by February of 2013. Overall, the applicant provides sufficient evidence of solid performance measures that meet the criteria, without weaknesses.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a solid plan for evaluating the effectiveness of funded activities that includes hiring an experienced external evaluation firm called Assessment Resource Center, who will conduct a rigorous evaluation. The evaluator will work with the national evaluator from the Department to identify and collect reliable and valid baseline data for program participants. Web-based and scanned surveys will be utilized. The applicant states that effectiveness of the Academy model, use of technology, professional development of educators, and other key components of the project will be evaluated from the perspective of diverse groups of stakeholders. However, the applicant does not clearly describe how it will use evaluation methods to improve working with community partners, compensation reform or service delivery and decision-making structures. As a result, the plan for evaluating effectiveness is strong, but missing a few details. Therefore, full points were not given for this section.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant clearly identifies all funds that will support the project as RTT-D funds, and provides a reasonable budget based on the needs of the project. A rational for each expenditure is included in the description of funds. For example, the applicant mentions the need for 1:1 laptops and distance learning technology in order to implement a personalized learning environment, and help every student in the district develop 21st Century skills. The applicant specifies which funds will be targeted for one-time investments, and includes a table listing each item, the first year cost, and follow-on year costs. Costs are reasonable in relation to project needs. A well described plan for ensuring long-term sustainability of personalized learning environments is explained, and includes examples of efficiencies, such as electronic text books, a new technology infrastructure and 21st Century classrooms, that will support project initiatives over time. The applicant provides sufficient support for a sound budget, that meets the criteria for this section.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a detailed description of a sustainability plan for extending project activities beyond the grant funded period. This plan includes efforts to establish strategic partnerships, develop strong internal systems, and a move from textbooks to online resources. There is also a plan to create a health clinic to improve attendance, and provide services through Medicaid reimbursements, once the needed infrastructure is created. The applicant proposes a supplemental budget for this activity. In addition, the RTT-D Project team plans to develop a sustainability team to generate financial resources in the years following the grant. The applicant also has a plan to assign a chief financial officer to investigate additional resources to sustain the project. As a result of this substantial plan, full points were awarded for this criteria.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a solid plan for establishing a partnership with four health agencies, in order to create a school based health clinic. A detailed description of a feasibility study is provided, which is designed to determine project costs, risks, savings and key considerations. The plan includes efforts to improve attendance and provide health services through Medicaid reimbursements to low-income students and staff. A list of seven population-level desired results outlines both educational and behavioral results. Examples include increased performance in English 2 and Algebra 2, and increases in student attendance by 1.2 percentage points by 2014-15. There is also a plan to hire an external evaluator to track project activities and collect data in a data warehouse. The applicant explains the rationale for targeting low-income students and includes a strategy to scale the model from one school based health clinic, to a clinic in each school. Methods for collaborating with community agencies such as the YMCA and a Family Center, in order to engage the community and align goals for improving education are also described. Overall, the applicant provides a strong plan for establishing a partnership to augment the education resources at the targeted schools, without any weaknesses.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly describes how it will create personalized learning environments that will improve student learning and teaching and support college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements through the implementation of five projects. Strategies include the development of small learning communities, on-line courses, project based learning, assessment teams, and professional development activities. Key components of the application that address the academic needs of each student include the use of Personal Plans of Study beginning in seventh grade, learner-centered classrooms, and multiple assessments that measure student achievement frequently. The applicant describes strategies for increasing graduation rates, such as the implementation of a credit recovery program, and an enhanced counseling program. A detailed plan to increase educator effectiveness is included, that targets training in the use of assessments and data analysis. The applicant provides sufficient evidence to meet this priority.

Total	210	190
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	15

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a plan to partner with four health agencies to implement a district sponsored health clinic in each school that will provide care for underserved students and employees. The plan includes a feasibility study, cultural surveys, space and location considerations and other relevant issues. The rationale for the center is based on desired results regarding increasing student attendance, decreasing drop-outs, and increasing student performance. This program will be evaluated by an external evaluator who will collect data on a quarterly and annual basis. The applicant clearly describes how it will integrate this initiative with educational programs by decreasing absenteeism. Costs for this program are planned to mostly be covered by Medicaid.

